

09/666,246

MS146917.2

REMARKS

Claims 2-26 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 2-11, 18 and 21 have been amended herein and claim 1 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Dependent claim 3 has been recast in independent form, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that the herein amendments to this claim do not narrow the scope thereof. Claims 22-26 have been newly added to emphasize various novel aspects of the subject invention and do not add limitations requiring further search. All pending claims are found at pages 2-5. Favorable consideration of the subject application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 2-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 2-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Holland, *et al.* (US 6,507,867). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Holland, *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc., v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 U.S.P.Q.2D 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Independent claims 3, 11, 18 and 21 have been amended to recite similar limitations regarding executing at least a portion of network-based application at a client *via* loading relevant portions of the application logic from a *local storage medium* and a server, *mapping* local requests to the logic, locally servicing the requests with the logic, and *servicing remote requests* on the server with application *logic residing on the server*. Holland, *et al.* does not teach or suggest such aspects of applicants' claimed invention. Instead, Holland, *et al.* teaches downloading requested web pages and, if available, associated pages, files and/or executable

09/666,246

MS146917.2

code, *from a server* (not a local storage medium) to a workstation to *locally service* web requests with *locally stored* information.

In particular, Holland, *et al.* does not teach or suggest providing relevant portions of application logic to a client *via a local storage medium*, as claimed in the subject invention. Instead, Holland, *et al.* teaches downloading requested web pages and related information from a *remote server bank*. As disclosed, Holland, *et al.* teaches web page requests are transmitted to a web server wherein one or more *server-side page repositories* (repository 310, 410) are accessed to retrieve the requested web page and "*all*" pages and files referenced in the requested web page. (See col. 14, lines 41-43). A bundle is then constructed, downloaded and stored, and locally utilized. Holland, *et al.* does disclose loading client-side *server software* from a storage medium to the workstation; however, such software pertains to the software to interface the client and server, and *not* the requested pages, files and/or code bundled, downloaded and accessed from the client. (See col. 8, lines 38-55). Hence, the web pages and associated data that are accessed on the workstation to service requests are remotely *downloaded from the server*. In contrast, the claimed invention recites that the application logic stored on the client to service requests can be provided *via a CD and/or floppy disk*. (See page 6, lines 9-10; page 7, lines 4-5; page 18, lines 9-11). Thus, Holland, *et al.* does not teach or suggest providing application logic to a client *via a local storage medium*, as recited in the subject claims, but merely employs data downloaded from a *server-side page repository* to service requests.

In addition, Holland, *et al.* does not teach or suggest *mapping requests to portions of application logic* residing on a workstation, as recited in the claimed invention. (See page 8, lines 21-25; page 18, lines 1-12). At most, Holland, *et al.* teaches an *index to correlate a web page with a bundle*, wherein the index provides a technique to locate a locally stored bundle in order to store bundles rather than pages, files and/or code on the workstation. (See page 12, lines 4-16; page 14, lines 62-65). Accordingly, Holland, *et al.* does not teach or suggest mapping local request to loaded application logic, as recited in the subject claims, but instead teaches indexes that provide associations to locally stored *bundles*.

Furthermore, Holland, *et al.* does not teach or suggest employing the *server to execute application logic to service remote requests*, as recited in the subject claims. As noted *supra*, Holland, *et al.* teaches downloading (e.g., *via a bundle*) requested web pages and any associated data from the server to a workstation in order *to service requests with data stored locally* on the

09/666,246

MS146917.2

workstation *rather than through the server*. Holland, *et al.* discloses that whenever a user transmits a web page request, a client-side server 460 associated with a workstation 470 determines whether the web page and associated data is stored on the workstation 470, and if not, a bundle request is transmitted to a server 440 to invoke the creation of a bundle comprising the requested information. The bundle is downloaded and stored on the workstation, and then the *locally stored* data is provided to the user to fulfill the request. (See col. 9, line 53 - col. 13 line 2; Fig. 4A-B). In contrast, the claimed invention recites execution of application logic residing on the server in response to remote requests. As disclosed, a server component (guarded tier 44) can include and execute application logic to service a remote request 56 from a client (presentation tier 24) at the server. (See page 25, lines 27-29). Therefore, not only does Holland, *et al.* not teach or suggest executing application logic on a server to service requests, as claimed in the subject claims, but Holland, *et al.* teaches techniques that inherently teach away from employing a server to service requests since requested data is always *downloaded to the workstation prior to being accessed*.

Moreover, Holland, *et al.* teaches an embedded *client-side sever* (a scaled down web server) "*must*" be installed on the *workstation* to request and retrieve bundled web pages, and associated pages, files and code. (See column page 5, lines 16-19 and 26-29). In contrast, the claimed invention executes application logic associated with a network-based application on a client *without* having to install *a network server on the client*. (See page 5, lines 12-14).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of independent claims 3, 11, 18 and 21 (and claims 2, 4-10, 12-17, and 19-20, which respectively depend therefrom) be withdrawn.

II. New Claims 22-26

Claims 22-26 have been added to highlight various distinct aspects of the subject invention described *supra*. Entry and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

09/666,246

MS146917.2

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 14 2003

OFFICIAL